

REMARKS:

Status of the Claims

Currently, claims 22-37 and 43-48 are pending in the application. Claims 39-42 have been cancelled. Claims 43-46 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 22 and 47 are independent claims for consideration.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, claim 42 has been cancelled for another reason in the above amendment.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 22-30, 37

Claims 22-30 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of Tuohino. The Examiner indicates in the Office Action that the switching control station 7 updates the position information of a mobile station, based on information obtained from **the base station** to which the mobile station is connected.

Claim 22 calls for “a transportation location finder configured to identify a communication area ... **based on movement information obtained from a traffic control that manages an operation of a transportation system including the transportation on which the mobile station is carried**”. The specification explains that:

Traffic control device 30 manages movements of the trains. Traffic controls device 30 keeps track of each train, specifically, has present location, train schedule, and other information related to the train such as delay.

paragraph 58 of US 2002/0147023

The claim language is very clear and the specification supports that **the traffic control recited in claim 22 manages an operation of a transportation system.** The base station disclosed in the reference does not control or manage an operation of a transportation system.

Since Tuohino is also silent about the transportation location finder as recited in claim 22, claim 22 should be allowable over the cited references. Since Kojima and Tuohino fail to disclose or teach the invention recited in claim 22, claims 23-37, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 22, should also be allowable over the cited references.

Claims 39 and 41-42

Claims 39 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima in view of Akiyama. Applicants have cancelled claims 39 and 41-42 in the above amendment.

Claim 40

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima and Akiyama further in view of Drury. Applicants have cancelled claim 40 in the above amendment.

Claims 47-48

Claims 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtikoinen et al (US Patent Publication 2002/0077060) in view of Kojima.

Lehtikoinen discloses that a user who enters a geographic area can wirelessly obtain information pertaining to the geographic area. An example discussed in Lehtikoinen is that a user who enters a train station can wirelessly obtain a train schedule, i.e., information as to when a particular train will arrive at the train station. The Examiner's position in the Office Action as to how Lehtikoinen is relevant to the invention recited in Claim 47 may be summarized as follows:

“If the mobile station whose location a user is looking for happens to be on a train, the train schedule as to when the train will arrive at the station will also provide the information of the future location of the mobile station.”

However, claim 47 specifically requires the user to ask the location of a mobile station (“a query receiver configured to receive an inquiry from a user asking a location of a mobile station”). On the other hand, in Lehtikoinen, the user is asking the schedule of a train, not the location of a mobile station. There is nothing in Lehtikoinen that discloses or teaches “a query receiver configured to receive an inquiry from a user asking a location of a mobile station.”

Second, claim 47 requires the location information providing system to find if the mobile station is situated on a transportation (“a location querier responsive to the inquiry to find if the mobile station is situated on a transportation”). The system recited in claim 47 has an intelligence to determine whether or not the inquired mobile station is on a transportation. On the other hand, Lehtikoinen only discloses the system which informs the user of a train schedule in response to a query about the train schedule and does not disclose or teach the claim limitation of “determining whether the mobile station is situated on a transportation”.

Third, claim 47 requires the system to transmit a response including information on the future location of the mobile station (“a transmitter configured to transmit to the user a response which comprises the determined future location of the mobile station”). On the other hand, in Lehtikoinen, just a train schedule is sent to the user. Thus, Lehtikoinen is silent about “a transmitter configured to transmit to the user a response which comprises the determined future location of the mobile station” as recited in claim 47.

Kojima discloses that when a call is made to a mobile station, the location of the mobile station is determined. If the mobile station is on a train, the train is also identified, and the call is made to the mobile station on the train. Please note that a caller of Kojima is not asking for the location of the mobile station, but just making a call

to the mobile station. The caller is indifferent about the location of the mobile terminal as long as his call is made to the mobile station. Therefore, like Lehtikainen, Kojima is silent about "a query receiver configured to receive an inquiry from a user asking a location of a mobile station".

Also, Kojima only discloses a call being made to a mobile station on a train. On the other hand, the location information providing system recited in claim 47 estimates the future location of the mobile station ("a location estimator configured to determine, if the mobile station is situated on a transportation, a future location of the mobile station by referring to the time schedules stored in the memory"). Kojima is necessarily silent about this claim limitation.

Furthermore, the system recited in claim 47 sends the inquiring user a response including information on the future location of the mobile station. Like Lehtikainen, there is nothing in Kojima which discloses or teaches "a transmitter configured to transmit to the user a response which comprises the determined future location of the mobile station".

As explained above, claim 47 is not obvious in view of Lehtikainen and Kojima, either individually or in combination. Since claim 47 is allowable over the cited reference, claim 48, dependent from claim 47, should also be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

August 27, 2008

Date

/Tadashi Horie/

Tadashi Horie
(Reg. No. 40,437)